

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/646,402	08/22/2003	Martin Kiesel	03869-105025	9503	
65989 KING & SPAL	7590 03/05/200 DING	EXAMINER			
1185 AVENUE	OF THE AMERICAS	š	CABRERA, ZOILA E		
NEW YORK,	NY 10036-4003		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2123		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/05/2008	ELECTRONIC	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptomailnyc@kslaw.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/646,402	KIESEL ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Zoila E. Cabrera	2123		

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE	REPLY FILED 21	November 2007 FAIL	S TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN C	CONDITION FOR ALL	OWANCE.
1. 🗵	The reply was file	ed after a final rejection	ı, but prior to or on	the same day as filin	g a Notice of Appeal.	To avoid abandonm

application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

### **AMENDMENTS**

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: \_ Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:

## AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s), 11/27/07

13. Other: .

/Zoila E. Cabrera/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2123 2/21/08

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Hays does not teach or suggest selecting for measurement at least one type of movement of the machine from a plurality of different peep of movements of the machine, and further argues that Hays relates to a signle type of machine movement, e.g., notational movement of a pump. Examiner disagrees because Hays discloses machine sensors such as rotating equipment ubration sensor for determining ubration of rotating equipment; motor vibration sensor for determining bearing ubration, angular velocity sensors; axial displacement machine sensor (Col 12, line 5-to Col, 13, lines 20-d. 13, lines 30-d. 1 and lines 65-86.). Therefore, Hays discloses other types of movements of the machine.

Examiner wants to clarify that the two lines on Page 2 of the Final rejection regarding a 102(b) were inadvertently left in the office action. However, it is clear that claims 1-25 are rejected under 103(a) as stated and described in the detailed action.